

## REMARKS

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Office Action dated March 7, 2007, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on June 7, 2007. Please reconsider the claims pending in the application for reasons discussed below.

Claims 1-15, 18-27 and 30-37 are pending in the application. Claims 2-4, 26, and 31. Applicants submit that the amendments do not introduce new matter.

### Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-4, 6-15, 18-27, 30-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by *Gupta et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,956,593, hereinafter, "*Gupta*").

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). The elements must be arranged as required by the claim. *In re Bond*, 910 F.2d 831, 15 USPQ2d 1566 (Fed. Cir. 1990).

With respect to claim 1, Applicants submit that *Gupta* does not teach providing a set of annotation structures, each associated with one or more of the annotatable data objects and each defining attributes of one or more user interfaces for manipulating annotations for the annotatable data objects, wherein the one or more user interfaces comprise at least one graphical user interface, based on an associated annotation structure; and providing one or more transforms for use in transforming annotations structures into graphical user interfaces, as recited in this claim. The limitations directed to providing one or more transforms were previously presented in now-cancelled claims 3 and 4. In rejecting those claims, the Examiner referred to portions of *Gupta* that do

not teach transforming any type of structure into a graphical user interface, but rather describe only a graphical user interface. In fact, there is no mention of any type of transform in Gupta at all.

Accordingly, Applicants submit claim 1 and its dependents are allowable and respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

With respect to claim 25, Applicants submit that *Gupta* does not teach receiving a request from one of the applications to create an annotation for a data object, wherein receiving a request from one of the applications to create an annotation for a data object comprises receiving the request from a plug-in component that provides an interface between the requesting application and the executable component for managing annotations, as recited in this claim. The limitations directed to receiving the request from a plug-in component that provides an interface between the requesting application and the executable component for managing annotations was previously presented in now-cancelled claim 26.

In rejecting that claim, the Examiner makes a conclusory statement that this claim contains similar limitations to other claims that were rejected based on *Gupta*. However, there is only a single mention of a “plug-in for Internet Information Server” in Gupta, and absolutely no mention of receiving a request to create an annotation from a plug-in component, as claimed. Similarly, claim 30 recites “a set of application plug-ins, each specific to one or more of the applications and configured to communicate with the annotation server via the application programming interface functions”.

Accordingly, Applicants submit claims 25 and 30, as well as their dependents are allowable and respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

With respect to claim 15, Applicants submit that *Gupta* does not teach retrieving one or more annotation structures associated with a data object and dependent, at least in part, on at least one credential of a user initiating the request, *wherein the at least one credential comprises a role of the user* and “generating a graphical user interface based on one of the annotation structures.”

The Examiner argues that *Gupta* teaches retrieving one or more annotation structures dependent on a role of the user Column 17, Lines: 31-36, which states:

In dialog box 420, a level of detail 422 to retrieve can be selected by the user. Different levels can be selected from a drop-down or pull-down menu by selecting icon 424. Examples of different levels that could be retrieved include the "full level" (that is, all content of the annotation), a "summary only" level, a "user identifier only" level, a "preview" level including only the first 512 bytes of data, etc.

However, Applicants submit, the cited section describes the amount of content of an annotation which may be displayed to a user after a query is executed. Nowhere in the cited section or any other portion of *Gupta* is *retrieving one or more annotation structures associated with a data object and dependent on at least one credential of a user* described. In fact, nowhere in *Gupta* is there any description of associating different annotation structures with different data objects at all.

Therefore, claim 15 and its dependents are believed to be allowable, and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

#### Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gupta as applied to claims above, and in view of *Kadel et al.* (U.S. Publication 2002/0184401, hereinafter, "*Kadel*"). Claim 5 is dependent off of claim 1, which Applicants submit is allowable for reasons discussed above. Accordingly, Applicants submit this claim is also allowable and respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

Conclusion

Having addressed all issues set out in the office action, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the claims be allowed.

Respectfully submitted, and  
**S-signed pursuant to 37 CFR 1.4,**

/Randol W. Read, Reg. No. 43,876/

Randol W. Read

Registration No. 43,876

PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.

3040 Post Oak Blvd. Suite 1500

Houston, TX 77056

Telephone: (713) 623-4844

Facsimile: (713) 623-4846

Attorney for Applicants